

REMARKS

Summary Of Office Action

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Boros, Mulitmedia White Paper, December 1999 (hereinafter "Boros").

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Boros.

Summary Of Applicant's Reply

Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 8, and 13.

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's Reply

I. The § 112 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner states that the phrase "which is incorporated" in

claim 1 and elsewhere is ambiguous and that it is unclear which method limitation the phrase limits. The Examiner also states that, in claim 7 and elsewhere, it is unclear which method limitation the phrase "incorporated into a cover" further limits. In claim 8 and elsewhere, the Examiner states that the scope of the "system" is unclear.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 8 and 13 to correct these deficiencies. In particular, claim 1 was amended such that the language "which is incorporated" is replaced with language that makes clear that financial prospectus data is stored on electronically readable media, and the electronically readable media is permanently affixed to a printed financial prospectus.

Claim 7 was amended to delete the language "incorporated into" and to make clear that the electronically readable media is affixed to a cover of the printed financial prospectus. (Claim 13 was similarly amended)

Claim 8 was amended such that it is clear that the system comprises at least one electronically readable media that stores financial prospectus data, and a printed financial prospectus on which the electronically readable media is permanently affixed.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 7, 8 and 13, as amended, and claims 2-6 and 9-12,

which respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 8, are definite and particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant notes that the Examiner did not provide specific reasons why claim 14 is indefinite. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 is definite - even without amendment. Nonetheless, applicant amended claim 14 to make clear that the printed prospectus contains an electronically readable media permanently affixed to a page of the printed prospectus. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 14, as amended, is definite and particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

II. The § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-5 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Boros.

In rejecting claims 1-5 and 14, the Examiner states that Boros teaches distributing prospectuses via the internet, via a CD-ROM, as well as in paper form. Boros does not make clear whether these CD-ROMs are delivered with printed prospectus data. The only suggestion to this effect is that "multimedia material ... could be made available to supplement disclosure ... that investors and their professional advisers

would ... reasonably expect to find in the ... text part of [a] prospectus." Nonetheless, there is no showing or suggestion in Boros of storing prospectus data on an electronically readable media and permanently affixing that media to a printed financial prospectus. Therefore, Boros does not show or suggest all of the features of applicant's independent claims 1 and 14, as amended, and, accordingly, independent claim 1, and claims 2-7 which depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Boros.

III. The § 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Boros.

As shown above with respect to the § 102 rejection, there is no showing or suggestion in Boros of storing prospectus data on an electronically readable media and permanently affixing that media to a printed financial prospectus.

Therefore, because Boros fails to show or suggest each and every limitation of applicant's claimed invention, claims 1-14 are not obvious in view of Boros.


Conclusion

The foregoing demonstrates that claims 1-14 are allowable. This application is therefore in condition for

Application No. 09/843,093
Amendment dated March 3, 2005

allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are accordingly
respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jared Kneitel
Registration No. 51,178
Agent for Applicant

Fish & Neave IP Group
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, York 10020
Tel.: (212) 596-9000